DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 710 CS 500 829

AUTHOR Erickson, Frederick; Shultz, Jeffrey
TITLE Talking to an "Us" or a "Them": Differences in Performing the Speech Function "Formulation" in School Counseling Interviews.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md. Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems.
PUB DATE Dec 73
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association (New Orleans, Louisiana, December 2, 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Communication Skills; *Counseling; *Counselor Attitudes; Educational Research; *Ethnic Groups; Guidance; *Interviews; *Junior College Students; Oral Communication; Sociolinguistics; Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The research reported in this document shows how two junior college counselors perform "explaining what we are doing now" differently, depending on the social personage or identity of the student, and identifies the social meaning of different forms of "explaining what we are doing now." It shows how in formulating, counselors can say more than they mean or mean more than they say, implicitly communicating to the student the counselor's expectations regarding the student's ability to do what he is told to do during the encounter, to understand advice given, or to achieve a desired future goal. This report is divided into three sections. Section 1 defines key terms and issues. Section 2 illustrates two types of formulation--"explicit" and "implicit"--by examples of utterances and by quantitative summaries of differences in the form of doing formulation. Section 3 presents implications of our "micro-ethnographic" analysis of school talk for a general theory on interethnic relations. (SW)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 096710

"Talking to an 'Us' or a 'Them': Differences in Performing the Speech Function 'Formulation' in School Counseling Interviews"[1, 2]

Frederick Erickson and Jeffrey Shultz[3]

Harvard University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Frederick Erickson
Jeffrey Shultz
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Introduction

This paper has two purposes. First, to show how two junior college counselors perform "explaiming what we are doing now" differently, depending on the social personage or identity of the student (including but not limited to the student's ethnicity..) Such explanations have been termed "formulating" by Garfinkel and Sacks (1971). The second purpose is to identify the social meaning of differemt forms of "explaining what we are doing now." To do this we must locate tthe speech act formulating in the context of the whole speech event counseling interview, and consider sociolinguistic functions of formulation im the conduct of interaction face to face.

We will attempt to show how in formulating, counselors can say more than they mean or mean more than they say, implicitly communicating to the student the counselor's expectations of the student's ability to do what he is told to do during the encounter, to understand advice given, or to achieve a desired future goal.

The paper has three main sections. In the first, key terms and issues are defined. In the second section, two types of formulation--"explicit" and "implicit"--are illustrated by examples of utterances and by quantitative

---

[1]The research reported here was sponsored by the Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems, NIMH (MH 18230 and MH21460) and also was supported by the Ford Foundation. The support of both is gratefully acknowledged.

[2]Paper presented at the symposium "School Talk: Issues in Sociolinguistic Analysis of Educational Settings" at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans, Lousiana, December 2, 1973.

[3]The study of formulation and presupposition as part of our broader inquiry into verbal and non-verbal features of interaction in gatekeeping encounters (reported in Erickson, 1973c) was initially suggested by Harold Garfinkel, John Gumperz, and Jenny Cook-Gumperz. Any defects in the analysis are the responsibility of the authors.

CS 500 829

summaries of differences in the form of doing formulation. Briefly noted in the third and final section are implications of our "micro-ethnographic" analysis of school talk for a general theory of inter-ethnic relations.

I. DEFINITION OF TERMS

1.1 Explicit and Implicit Formulation

Garfinkel and Sacks use the term formulation to stand for "conversationalists' practices of saying-in-so-many-words-what-we-are-doing." (1971: 351) The following quote from a counseling encounter illustrates formulation in the specific sense of the term: (formulation is underlined)

> 1)a C: Now ah...as far as next semester, why don't we give some thought to ah...to what you'd like to take there. Do you plan on continuing along this P.E. major?

In this example the counselor is "decontextualizing" interactional process. He has attempted to reduce the ambiguity of what-I-want-us-to-be-doing-now by trying to say so in so many words. We characterize this type of formulation as explicit. In other cases the counselor and student talk about what-we-are-doing-now without making explicit references to the meta-conversational content of their talk We characterize this as implicit formulation.

> 2)a C: OK, now this semester.
> b S: This semester?
> c C: English 102?
> d S: A "C", probably a "C".
> e C: You are a student here, right?
> f S: Yeah.
> g C: (Registered) in the school?
> h S: I...
> i C: All right, English 102...Right?
> j S: Yeah.
> k C: Math?
> l S: Naw, I didn't take math.

If we were to rewrite the implicit formulations in the passage above to make them explicit we might get the following lines: for 2-b ("This semester?") rewrite "Do you want me to tell you the courses I am taking this semester or the grades in those courses?". For 2-c ("English 102?") rewrite "I want you to tell me the courses you are taking, not the grades." For 2-d (A "C", probably a "C"), rewrite "I'm assuming you want me to tell you my grades rather than the courses I am taking this semester." For 2-e ("You are a student here, right?") rewrite "That (2-d) is the wrong answer. You have been a student here long enough to know that at this point in these interviews I want to know what courses you have taken, not what grades you got in those courses." For 2-g ("in the school?") rewrite "You are still not giving me the right answer. You took my question literally instead of figuratively." For 2-h rewrite "I know I'm doing something wrong but I'm not sure what to do next." For 2-i ("all right...right?") rewrite "All right, let's start over from the beginning. I am telling you to give me course numbers as answers as I ask you if you are now taking English 102... Right?" For 2-k rewrite "By asking you the next question I am telling you that you now are giving the correct answers to the question-answer sequence I want to go through." (Note that question 2-k has the double function of asking for new information and telling the student he gave the correct answer to the previous question.)

Rewriting the formulation utterances to make explicit their meaning is a problematic exercise[1] but to the extent that it is possible in any degree it is only possible by considering the function of the utterance in the total speech event or "language game" There are various terminologies and procedures for doing this that are current in the specialized fields

---

[1] The reasons that rewriting is problematic will be considered later in this section.

of "ordinary language philosophy," "generative semantics", and the "ethnography of speaking" or "sociolinguistics". Some details of these different analytic schema are mutually inconsistent but there are general similarities among them. We will sketch the issues and terminologies in broad strokes below.

1.2 Formulation as an "Illocutionary Act"

J. L. Austin, following the thinking of the late Wittgenstein, made a distinction between saying things and doing (performing) things by saying things. He distinguished between locutionary and illocutionary acts (Austin 1962: 98), suggesting that illocution involves the performance of more than just speaking an utterance. Illocutionary acts are identified by performative verbs, such as asking a question, warning someone, or promising to do something. Features of social and interactional context as well as linguistic form are involved in judging whether or not an illocutionary act has been successfully accomplished, e.g., for a speaker to perform the correct syntax and phonology in saying a marriage vow, while secretly intending to get a divorce the next week, is to perform the locution correctly but not to do the illocution "promising," which for successful performance involves the extralinguistic considerations of sincerity, lack of coercion, etc.

> "...we can see that in order to explain what can go wrong with statements we cannot just concentrate on the proposition involved...as has been done traditionally. We must consider the total situation in which the utterance is issued...if we are to see the parallel between statements and performative utterances and how each can go wrong." (Austin 1962: 18)

By calling for analysis of the illocutionary act in terms of the total context of speech situation, Austin follows Wittgenstein's notion of meaning as constituent in the total organization of a lanaguage game. In the Philosophical Investigations (1968) Wittgenstein comments on the

semantic analysis of words:

> "One cannot guess how a word functions. One has to look at its use and learn from that." (PI, sect. 340)

In The Blue and Brown Books (1958)
He extends the same principle to the analysis of utterances:

> "...Let us see what use we make of such an expression as 'This face says something' that is, what the situations are in which we use this expression, what sentences would precede or follow it (what kind of conversation it is a part of)."

Language games have their own order, but many of them cannot be abstracted from the social world within which the game occurs. This is especially true for illocutionary acts. Searle (1969) refines Austin's notions of the extralinguistic conditions that must be met in order that an illocutionary act be performed successfully. Here are the linguistic and extralinguistic conditions involved in performing the illocutionary act promising sincerely and non-defectively (Searle 1969: 57-59):

"1. Normal input and output conditions obtain (both know language, are not deaf, etc.)

2. S(speaker) expresses the proposition that p in the utterance of T (sentence)

3. In expressing that p, S predicates a future act A of S

4. H (hearer) would prefer S's doing A to his not doing A, and S believes H would prefer his doing A to his not doing A

5. It is not obvious to both S and H that S will do A in the normal course of events.

6. S intends to do A (sincerity condition)

7. S intends that the utterance of T will place him under an obligation to do A (essential condition)

8. S intends (i-I) to produce in H the knowledge (K) that the utterance of T is to count as placing S under an obligation to do A. S intends to produce K by means of the recognition of (i-I) and he intends (i-I) to be recognized in virtue of (by means of) H's knowledge of the meaning of T.

9. The semantic rules of the dialect spoken by S and H are such that T is correctly and sincerely uttered if and only if conditions 1-8 obtain."

Searle identifie four rule types as conditions for characterizing such rules as 1-9 above: (a) rules for propositional content, (b) Preparatory condition, (c) sincerity condition, and (d) essential condition. All conditions must be met for the indefectible performance of an illocutionary act.

In addition to the typology of consitutive rules for illocutionary acts, Searle presents a typology of acts (1969: 66-67). Two of his types are "advising" and "warning". The speech function we are concerned with in this paper--formulation--can be either advice or warning, or both at once. Here are Searle's conditions for the illocutionary acts advise and warn (1969: 67).

	Advise	Warn
Propositional content	Future act A of H (hearer).	Future event or state, etc., E.
Preparatory condition	1. H has some reason to believe A will benefit H. 2. It is not obvious to both S and H that H will do A in the normal course of events.	1. H has reason to believe E will occur and is not in H's interest. 2. It is not obvious to both S and H that E will occur.
Sincerity condition	S believes A will benefit H	S believes E is not in H's best interest.
Essential condition	Counts as an undertaking to the effect that A is in H's best interest.	Counts as an undertaking to the effect that E is not in H's best interest.
	Contrary to what one might suppose advice is not a species of requesting. It is interesting to compare "advise" with "urge," "advocate," and "recommend." Advising you is not trying to get you to do something in the sense that requesting is. Advising is more like telling you what is best for you.	Warning is like advising, rather than requesting. It is not, I think, necessarily an attempt to get you to take evasive action. Notice that the above account is of categorical not hypothetical warnings. Most warnings are probably hypothetical: "If you do not do X then Y will occur."

1.3 The Notion of Presupposition

The underlying conditions can also be termed presuppositions and were so termed by Austin (1962: 48ff). This seems to be the preferred term of the generative semanticists associated with Fillmore. Keenan, for example, defines presuppositions as "those conditions that the world must meet in order for the sentence to make literal sense." (Keenan 1971: 45). Presupposition as used by Austin and Searle refers only to the necessary conditions for the nondefectible performance of an illocutionary act. According to Garner (1971: 38-40) Fillmore uses presupposition more loosely to include non-necessary conditions, or speaker implication (see also Grice, 1961). Garner terms this the presupposition of sentences (Utterance acts) rather than of the analytic construct illocutionary act. While this may be bad logic we think it is appropriate for sociolinguistic semantic analysis, because the semantic complexity of natural language produced in actual speech situations cannot be comprehended by the logical models of ordinary language philosophy.

Searle himself refers to the semantic complexity of actual speech in actual speech situations in the following example (Searle 1969: 70):

> "...It is important to realize that one and the same utterance may constitute the performance of several different illocutionary acts... suppose at a party a wife says 'it's really quite late.' That utterance may be at one level a statement of fact; to her interlocutor, who has just remarked on how early it was, it may be (and be intended as) an objection to her husband; it may be (and be intended as) a suggestion or even a request('Let's go home') as well as a warning ('You'll feel rotten in the morning if you don't')."

Despite this complexity, Searle asserts earlier in his work that although we can mean more than we say, "whatever can be meant can be said." He terms this the principle of expressibility (Searle 1969: 19):

> "even in cases where it is in fact impossible to say exactly what I mean it is in principle possible to come to be able to say exactly what I mean. I can in principle if not in fact increase my knowledge of the language...or I can... enrich the language by introducing new terms or other devices into it...For any meaning X and any speaker S whenever S means (intends to convey, wishes to communicate in an utterance, etc.) X then it is possible that there is some expression E such that E is an exact expression of or formulation of X. Symbolically (s) (X) (S means X $\rightarrow$ P ($\exists$E) (E is an exact expression of X)."

1.4 "A Principle of Inexpressibility" in Natural Language

The principle of expressibility overlooks crucial sociolinguistic facts. First, given that natural language is produced in interaction between at least two persons, any attempt by speaker A to explain what he is saying communicates something new about the social relationship between Speaker A and Speaker B, i.e, any attempt to clarify referential meaning has social meaning. No matter how definite a speaker becomes in trying to say what he means, he continuously adds social meaning by implication[1] in his attempts to explain himself.

Second, the natural language produced in face-to-face interaction is inherently indexical, and therefore to some extent ambiguous. This is the point made by Moerman (1969) in his critique of semantic elicitation techniques in cognitive anthropology. It is also the central tenet of the ethnomethodologists--Garfinkel and his associates.

In their article on formulation, Garfinkel and Sacks maintain that all attempts to explain face to face what-we-are-doing/meaning are inherently problematic (Garfinkel and Sacks 1971: 353):

---

[1] In Cicourel's terms (1972 the social relationship between speakers is always dynamic--role and status are continuously being renegotiated, implicitly as well as explicitly. In Goffman's terms, (1959: 1) definition of situation is continuously changing in subtle ways.

> "...in that formulations consist of glosses, and in that the properties that formulations exhibit as notational displays.... are properties of indexical expressions, the very resources of natural language assure that doing formulating is itself for members a routine source of complaints, faults, troubles, and recommended remedies, essentially."

In Searle's terms, the essential ambiguity of utterance acts by which speakers attempt to perform the illocutionary act explaining/formulating cause the performance of explaining/formulating to be defectible to some degree in every case.

We maintain, with Garfinkel that given essentially contexted nature of speech face to face, the conduct of face to face interaction necessarily involves speaker implication--indeed is constituted by speaker implication, and that therefore to study natural language what we must examine is not only the necessary (presupposed) conditions underlying utterance acts, but the non-necessary (implied) conditions as well.

This means not only that as members of encounters we can never say what we mean in so many words, but that as researchers we can never be sure what informants meant in their attempts to explain what they meant to each other. Our attempts to rewrite what they say on the basis of logical considerations (presupposition) cannot exhaust the full potential meaning of their utterances (presupposition plus implication).

1.5 Formulation in the Perspective of "Ethnography of Speaking"

We have reviewed terminology and issues in the study of illocutionary acts by philosophers of language to illustrate the complexity of semantic judgments interlocutors must make in understanding the meaning of advising or warning or formulating. But actual speakers in everyday life do not perform illocutionary acts. They perform what Searle terms utterance acts. These are what Hymes (1962) terms speech acts, which are components

of speech events that occur in and are semantically embedded in speech situations.

Searle's example of the sentence a woman could say at a party, "It's really quite late," would be characterized by Hymes as a speech act. The meaning of the speech act varies, in terms of who the speaker is as a social person to various hearers--conversational partner, guest, wife.[1]

Examples such as Searle's illustration how different referential (and social) meanings can be communicated by the same linguistic form to different hearers, depending on their social relationship with the speaker. Blom and Gumperz (1972) consider how the same speaker and hearer can convey different social meanings through using different linguistic forms. They studied "code-switching" within the same speech event (a conversation between fellow villagers)--switching back and forth between the syntacically different language forms of "standard" Norwegian and "nonstandard" local dialect. The non-standard and standard language forms were employed for different topics (which varied in degree of intimacy, c.f. Simmel, 1950: 126) and for communicating changes in the ongoing social relationship of rights and obligations between speakers. Blom and Gumperz term these changes "situational shifts" (1972: 424-426).

For our speech event, "school gatekeeping encounter" the findings of Blom and Gumperz suggest that differences in the language form by which formulation is attempted may indicate changes in the social relationship between speakers--either changes across time in the same interview due to renegotiation of role and status (Cicourel, op. cit.), or to differences in social relationship from one interview to another according to the social personage of each interviewee.

---

[1] This is the situational factor "sender" notes by Hymes.(1962)

This led us to a number of researchable questions:

1. What aspects of the social personage (social identity) of interviewees vary from one interview to another?

2. What aspects of the form of language and interactional process employed in doing explicit and implicit formulation vary from one interview to another?

3. What is the relationship between variation in (1) and in (2)?

One aspect of language form that seemed to vary according to social personage was the form of advising/warning by giving commands. The first example presented earlier illustrates one form of command:

Example 1) C: Why don't be give some thought to ah... to what you'd like to take there (next semester).

The syntactic form for this imperative is an interrogative--a why-question. Green (n.d.) terms this use of the syntax of a request to issue a command as a "wh-imperative." She argues that requests presuppose that the speaker does not have authority over the hearer, and that the hearer has a number of options available to choose from (including the option of refusing to fulfill the request.) Conversely, imperatives presuppose authority by the speaker over the hearer.

It seems to us that for a speaker with authority over the hearer (counselor) to use successfully the why-question form in performing a speech function inconsistent with that form (a command), there must be a contextual "reading" of meaning by the hearer that involves the speaker. The whimperative is a role-distancing device (c.f. Goffman 1961: 105-106) by which a social superordinate can "say" to a subordinate "I am a person with authority over you, but I choose to act as if I didn't, thereby telling you to regard me as 'nice.'" The illocutionary force of "pledging niceness" can be vitiated by distrust

in the hearer. So it is risky to attempt an indefectible performance of a whimperative in speech situations in which the hearer is likely to distrust the speaker. Yet it is precisely in these situations of potential distrust that we may want to say to the other, "Trust me."

We consider the use of a whimperative in such social situations as a "damaged metaphorical" shift (c.f. Gumperz, ibid.), or a twisted meta-message (c.f. Bateson, 1955). [1] The white counselors quoted in Example 1 employed whimperatives only in encounters with students whose social personage (Black) included membership in a social group whose members are conventionally considered likely to distrust white people. In encounters with white students the counselor gave commands in imperative linguistic form.

1.6 Some aspects of Social Personage--Ethnicity, Pan-ethnicity, and Co-membership

Ethnicity (actually ethnicity/race) is one of the social identification classes for persons according to which variations in formulation style were examined. We mean by "ethnicity" the nontechnical American definition--membership in a nationality or racial group. Ethnic categories represented in the examples reported in this paper include Italian-American, Irish-American, and Black American.

Ethnic group membership is only one aspect of the social identity ("status set," "cumulative status") presented face to face. Other attributes of status include organizational terms for definition such as "last year student", 2nd year student", "student with 3.5 grade average." Parsons (1951) terms these universalistic attributes

---

[1] In the example given "why don't we give some thought," it is also interesting that the speaker, who is white, uses the pronoun of solidarity("we," c.f. Brown and Gilman, 1960) in talking to a student who is Black. This additional metaphoric content produces a "double-double" message.

of status.

In addition, particularistic attributes of status other than ethnicity were always revealed by the counselor and the student, sometimes inadvertently, othertimes intentionally and strategically (c.f. Barth, 1969). One such particularistic attribute we termed "pan-ethnicity." This is a more generalized identification category than ethnicity. It tends to predict, with some exceptions, a combination of nationality/race, social class, residence, and religious affiliation. One pan-ethnic category in our sample was "white ethnic people" (Italian, Polish, Irish-Americans who tend to be lower-middle or middle class and to live in neighborhoods near the outer rim of the city or in non-elite suburbs, and tend to be members of the Roman Catholic Church). The other pan-ethnic category was "Third World people" (Black, Puerto Rican, and Mexican-Americans who tend to be working class or unemployed "underclass," reside nearer the center of the city, and tend to be Protestant, in the case of Blacks, or members of the Roman Catholic Church, in the case of Latins.) Members of a pan-ethnic category may be culturally different (Italian/Polish, Black/Mexican) but socially similar in terms of rank, residence, recency of arrival, etc.

Folk terminology ("Third World," "Middle American") tends to support the "emic" validity of our notion of pan-ethnicity as an analytic construct. In addition, for the 82 gatekeeping encounters in our total sample, pan-ethnicity predicts such outcomes of the encounter as "friendliness", "special help", and "interaction process symmetry" better than does ethnicity.[1]

---

[1]This suggests that other factors in addition to cultural sharing are accounting for the treatment received by interviewees. This finding and its implications are discussed in detail in Erickson 1973a, 1973b, and 1973c.

One more class of attributes of status seemed to affect the micro social structure of the encounter, and to predict differences in formulation style. This was an identification class even more generalized than that of pan-ethnicity. We termed this social category "co-membership" and ranked encounters in our sample as "low," "medium," or "high" in co-membership. "Co-membership" refers to particularistic commonalities between two speakers that may include ethnicity, cultural similarity, or social rank but may also transcend them. Co-membership is often not initially obvious to participants in an encounter (as is race and often ethnicity). Examples of the "leakage" of co-membership during face to face interaction would be (1) an Irish-American counselor and a Chicano student both revealing that they had attended the same parochial school, or (2) an Italian-American counselor revealing that he had been a high school wrestling coach and a Polish student revealing that he was on the junior college wrestling team.

Neither of these attributes of status (the "old school tie," and "wrestling") are "ethnic" but both are particularistic. Neither are defined by the universalistic rules of the junior college as relevant interactional "resources" within the frame of the gatekeeping encounter. Indeed the "leakage" of such particularistic attributes of status as ethnicity, pan-ethnicity, or co-membership is proscribed by the formal organization's charter, as found in the junior college catalogue. Yet ethnicity, pan-ethnicity, and co-membership seem to affect the treatment received by students and the form of language employed by counselors more than any universalistic attributes of student status, such as grades and test scores.

II.

EXAMPLES OF EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT FORMULATION

2.1 Variations in the Use of Explicit Formulation

One counselor at a public junior college ("Fulton Junior College") used formulation differently in advising different students to check for further information about something the students should do or wanted to do. Language form varied according to the social personage of the student, specifically the student's pan-ethnicity and co-membership (for this Irish-American counselor there were no intra-ethnic interviews, so for him we have only pan-ethnic comparisons).

In the first example the student was Black (inter pan-ethnic encounter) and the co-membership was "low". The counselor did explicit formulation using a whimperative:

3) a C: OK...if you want to stay in the medical field have you examined what areas in the medical field you could go into?...uh with a college degree?
b S: ...No...
c C: May I suggest that you do that?
d S: ...Well you...do you...("What do you mean, 'that'?")
e C: A sstr...with a...with a straight...a college degree ...what...areas of medicine you could go into or what areas in the field of medicine you could go into? ("I mean what I just said in 3-a")
f S: Yeah... (spoken without paralinguistic markers of agreement or enthusiasm)

In the next example the student was Polish-American (intra pan-ethnic encounter) and the co-membership was "medium". The counselor begins with an altered whimperative (or"what-perative") formulation ("What I would suggest") and then changes it to a straight imperative ("Check with her"):

4) a C: ---(indicates editorial omission) inasmuch as you've had English 101 and Math 101, uh...what I would suggest that you take, uh...would be English 102 which is a ...sequence to 101--you say you're not doing too well in math right now?

b S: No.
c C: Mmhm, probably when...what I would suggest you do is check with your teacher and uh...see what,.. who do you have this semester?
d S: Uh...I can't think, a...Steinitz.
e C: Steinitz, ah,..check with her and ask her what her ideas are with regards to either going on---in Math 102 or whether she thinks it might be advantageous for you to move from Math 101 to 103...Okay?
f S: Okay.

A few speaking turns earlier in the same encounter two more explicit formulations occur, both semi-direct commands--one, in the form of "let me give you" another a comment by the counselor on his suggestion that the student consider transfering from Fulton Junior College to a four year school of lower rank ("Catholic U.") rather than to a higher ranking school ("State"):

4-1) a C: ...Let me give you another reason for not going to State. (both laugh)...ah...State's business school...is ah...very, very tough on transfer courses from Fulton--as far as, you know, directly transferring from Fulton to State you couldn't do it---whereas a school like Catholic U., I... I'm kinda pushing Catholic U. (both laugh) it sounds like it anyhow, uh...is...uh...going to be much more liberal in their transfer policy, so you might want to investigate this.

Here the counselor follows his formulating comment "I'm kinda pushing Catholic U" with another masked command in slightly different form than a whimperative, indicated above by a broken dotted line. ("You might want to investigate" can be rewritten as an imperative.)

In the next example the student was Polish-American and the co-membership was "high." Rather than using whimperative formulations or "might want to" imperatives the counselor urges the student simply and directly to check on transfer requirements:

5) a C: --one of the things you could do is check.
b S: Yeah I will...I gonna get in on that.
c C: Please do that, because the sooner you know, the easier it's gonna be for you to make a decision---
* * *
S: I'm trying for the "A" in there...I'm trying, I'm bustin' for it.
C: Okay, please do me one favor and check with State.

In performing commands directly the counselor has simplified the micro-social structure of the encounter by not attempting to mask his authority over the student by rold distancing. In addition he communicates that his exercise of authority over the student is beneficent, by showing personal concern for the student's outcomes, adding "Please do that--do me one favor" to the command "Check with State."

The quotes from the three different encounters illustrate different means of telling a student to do something. When the student was a fellow pan-ethnic with high co-membership (Example 5) the Irish-American counselor used direct commands and no formulation. When the student was a fellow pan-ethnic but with medium co-membership (examples 4 and 4-1) the counselor employed mixed forms for commands--direct commands, altered whimperatives, and an explicit formulation that editorialized on the directness of his urging. When the student was not a fellow pan-ethnic and had low co-membership (Example 3) the counselor used an explicit formulation in pure whimperative form ("May I suggest that you do that?"

The first example of formulation presented in the paper comes from another inter pan-ethnic, low co-membership encounter between the same Irish-American counselor and a different Black student. Again, the "whimperative" is employed.

1) a C: Now, as far as next semester...Why don't we give some though to ah...to what you'd like to take there---

In contrast, in an encounter between this counselor and yet another Black student with whom the counselor has medium co-membership, we find the same lack of formulation and directness of commands that characterized

example 5 in which the student was Polish-American with high co-membership. The counselor is discussing the student's transfer to a four year school, a transfer planned for the next fall.

6) a C: If you find that you're gonna...that you're gonna have to come back here, please stop in and see...give me a buzz during the summer
b S: Okay
c C: The minute you find out definitely...from Southeastern State that you won't be accepted...let me know or...conversely if you find out that you are going to be accepted I'd like to know that too, but there isn't nearly the a...the necessity. Okay?

Here the commands are direct ("stop in and see--give me a buzz--let me know"). The counselor has authority over the student and will use it to help him (the counselor has another job for the summer and so corrects "stop in" to "give me a buzz", which presupposes that the student has the counselor's home telephone number.) (He did in fact have it.) Before, during, and after this interview the counselor had gone out of his way to be helpful to this student in a benevolent, albeit patronizing way. Notice also that the counselor communicates the expectation that the student might not be admitted to four year school ("the minute you find out definitely--that you won't be accepted"). Because the expectation is communicated explicitly, however, the counselor is in touch with it, and corrects himself ("conversely if you find out that you are going to be accepted---").

In Example 3, from the low-comembership encounter with a Black student illustrated earlier the counselor communicates low expectations, but does it implicitly through formulating by whimperative: Because the expectation is communicated through syntax rather than lexicon the counselor may be unaware of what he is doing.

3) a C: ---have you examined what areas in the medical field you could go into?
S: ...No...

c C: May I suggest that you do that?("By my metaphoric way of explaining that you should have looked into this before coming to see me I am telling you that you are a person who does not know what he is doing")

The student commented on this passage while watching a videotape of his encounter with the counselor:

3a) Student Viewing Session Comment
S: I think that uh...right there instead of telling me that uh...asking me and I checked into uh...what kind fields I could go in with a straight degree I think he shoulda then maybe given me a few suggestions like saying well, ah...you can go on to become a pediatrician, or...obstetrician... things like this instead of ah asking me had I checked into it and telling me... that I should check into it---

The student has interpreted "May I suggest that you do that?" as telling, not requesting or suggesting. The counselor's low expectations are made explicit later in the interview, when he suggests that the student (who had originally said he was interested in "something in the field of medicine", a strategically vague opener) become a male nurse with a four year degree.

After suggesting the male nurse career option (to which the student responded noncommitally), re-suggesting it, and advising toward it even though the student did not show interest nonverbally or verbally, the counselor then editorialized on what he had been doing in a formulation analogous to the one in Example 4-1 (Polish-American student with medium co-membership) "I'm kinda pushing Catholic U---":

3-1) a C: (long silence) You're gonna...uh...if you're thinking of goin on...or if you're thinking of nursing...as I'm think of nursing (student laughs slightly)for you. But if you ever start thinking of nursing...you're gonna find th...some of the courses that you're taking here are probably

not the appropriate courses that you should be taking. ("What I am saying is that not only are you not going to make it in medicine; you may have difficulty getting into a four year school at all.")

In summary, the amount and the style of explicit formulation used by the counselor in the examples presented here, varies according to the pan-ethnic status of the student, and according to the amount of co-membership with the student. Co-membership occasionally over-rides pan-ethnicity, as in example 4 in which the Polish-American student was of the same pan-ethnic class as the counselor (and the counselor used formulation and whimperative) but had "medium" co-membership, and in example 6, in which the Black student was of a different pan-ethnic class ("Third World") from the counselor but had medium co-membership. In that case the counselor did not use formulation or whimperative.

2.2 Implicit Formulation as Indexical Repair

As Garfinkel and Sacks use the term, formulation refers to trying-to-say-in-so-many-words-what-we-are-doing-now. It is an explanation that one is explaining what he means; an attempt to repair the indexicality of talk face to face, which as Garfinkel and Sacks maintain, is inherently and essentially indexical.[1]

In a more general sense, formulation can be taken to mean any attempt to repair the indexicality of talk face to face, whether or not the indexical repair is labeled as such by the attempt to state it in-so-many-words. Implicit formulation, then, can refer to any attempt at indexical repair that is not stated in-so-many-words, such as our example 2:

---

[1]"Indexicality" refers to the inherent property of language as ambiguous. Lexical items, like items in an index, refer to much more "meaning" or "information" than the items state in-so-many-words (or morphemes, or information bits). "Indexical repair" then, is an attempt to state more explicitly more of that to which a lexical item or phrase refers, e.g., this footnote is an attempt at indexical repair. Indexical repair can also be an attempt to restate the same "amount" of meaning metaphorically, as in example 2 . For further discussion, see Bar-Hillel 1952.

2) a C: OK, now this semester.
S: This semester? ("What should I be doing?")
C: English 102? ("Give me course numbers")
S: A "C", probably a "C".
C: You are a student here, right? ("You have been around long enough to know the routine--course numbers before grades")

It seems to us that such implicit formulations have social meaning. For a speaker to explain something just said or direct the conversation by not saying in-so-many-words that he is doing explaining or directing and for the speaker to present the explanation itself in indexical form, may be a way of saying to the hearer "You are 'one of us'--a person who understands things without my having to tell you in-so-many-words." Stating implicitly a formulation or explanation presupposes a hearer capable of understanding what was said (provided that Searle's "sincerity" condition obtains, and the speaker is not attempting to confuse or mystify the hearer. or say to him "You are an outsider" by producing an unintelligible utterance.)

If we are correct in our assumption that formulation/explanation always presupposes and therefore implies in performance some kind of social distance between speaker and hearer (because "among us such things go without saying"), then we would expect to see less indexical repair, explicit or implicit, among persons similar to one another on some dimension, such as ethnicity, pan-ethnicity, or co-membership. On the other hand, persons who are very similar along one social dimension but different in terms of organizational membership position (one of them a "counselor" member, the other a "student" member) might do more explanation/formulation (the counselor would want to be especially sure the student understood the questions asked).

2.3 A "Double Hypothesis" for Indexical Repairs

Following this line of reasoning one would expect that there would be more formulation/explanation in inter-ethnic and low co-membership encounters, and also in intra-ethnic and high co-membership encounters. (Actually, we would expect more formulation inter-ethnically and more explanation intra-ethnically, but the data available from the two counselors used as examples here did not permit this comparison). We tested this "bi-modal" hypothesis on a sample of encounters between 13 students and two counselors. When the number of all indexical repairs was totaled for each encounter we found that overall there was more indexical repair inter ethnically and inter pan-ethnically, and also that there was more indexical repair in those encounters ranked high and low in co-membership than in those encounters ranked medium in co-membership. Thus both propositions in our slightly unorthodox hypothesis were confirmed. The following tables illustrate the findings and the stylistic differences between the two counselors. (All the utterance examples presented earlier have been from the counselor designated "1" in the tables, except example 2, which is from the counselor designated "2".)

INSTANCES OF INDEXICAL REPAIR

Counselor 1

	(n)	% of Lines in Transcript	Average # of repairs	Average length of repairs (lines of transcript)	Average # of repairs initiated by Student	Average # of repairs initiated by Counselor	Average length of repairs initiated by Student	Average length of repairs initiated by Counselor
Pan-ethnic	(2)	52	15.0	4.1	5.0	10.0	3.5	4.5
Inter Pan-ethnic	(3)	65	17.3	3.1	5.3	12.0	2.6	3.4
High Co-Membership	(1)	55	18.0	3.8	8	10	3.5	4.0
Medium Co-Membership	(2)	53	13.0	3.3	2.5	11.5	3.0	3.4
Low Co-Membership	(2)	66	19.0	3.5	6.5	12.5	2.6	3.9
	5							

Counselor 2

	(n)	% of Lines in Transcript	Ave # of repairs	Ave length of repairs	Ave # of repairs initiated by Student	Ave # of repairs initiated by Counselor	Ave length of repairs initiated by Student	Ave length of repairs initiated by Counselor
Intra Ethnic	(5)	32	8.2	4.6	3.4	4.8	4.5	4.8
Inter Ethnic	(3)	39	9.0	4.7	3.7	5.3	3.6	5.4
High Co-Mem.	(2)	30	11.5	4.1	5.5	6	4.2	4.3
Medium Co-Mem.	(3)	32	6.0	4.3	2.3	3.7	4.7	4.1
Low Co-Mem.	(3)	40	9.0	5.3	3.3	5.7	3.7	6.2
	8							

Both Counselors Combined

	(n)	% of Lines in Transcript	Ave # of repairs	Ave length of repairs	Ave # of repairs initiated by Student	Ave # of repairs initiated by Counselor	Ave length of repairs initiated by Student	Ave length of repairs initiated by Counselor
High Co-Mem.	(3)	37	13.7	4.0	6.3	7.3	3.9	4.2
Medium Co-Mem.	(5)	40	8.8	3.8	2.4	6.4	4.0	3.7
Low Co-Mem.	(5)	50	13.0	4.2	4.6	8.4	3.1	4.8
Overall	13	42	11.5	4.0	4.2	7.4	3.6	4.3

2.4 Examples of Implicit and Explicit Formulation from Counselor 2

Indexicality can be repaired explicitly or implicitly. The second counselor, an Italian-American, tended to use implicit indexical repair with students who were also Italian-American. He used explicit indexical repair more frequently with Polish-American students (for this counselor we do not have any examples of inter pan-ethnic encounters).

Characteristically, after beginning the interview by asking the student to fill out a schedule card Counselor 2 would give an ambiguous command, "OK, this semester..." This command, framed as an explicit formulation, might read "OK, at this point in the interview I want to know what courses you are taking this semester. Since I have here in front of me a list of the courses you registered for I will read off the list and you tell me whether or not you are taking the course."

In the next example, in an interview with a Polish-American student who has medium co-membership with the counselor, the ambiguity of "OK, this semester..." is repaired explicitly by the counselor.

7) a C: --OK, this semester...English 102?
b S: You mean, uh...
c C: No, no...these are the courses you're taking
d S: Yes.
e C: English 102, Engineering 131...
f S: Yes.

The same need for indexical repair occurs in an encounter with an Italian-American student, with whom the counselor has high co-membership.

Indexical repair is conducted implicitly by the counselor, and repair attempts are continued in the implicit form appropriate for organizational "insiders" even though the student shows he is having trouble understanding. This is the now familiar Example 2.

2) a C: OK, now this semester.
b S: This semester? ("Grades or courses?)
c C: English 102? ("Give me courses")
d S: A "C", probably a "C".

e C: You are a student here, right? ("As an insider you are supposed to know these routines without my telling you")
f S: Yeah.
g C: (registered) in the school? ("I meant the last question figuratively, not literally")
h S: I...("I don't know what to do next")
i C: All right, English 102...Right? ("Say 'yes' to courses")
j S: Yeah.
k C: Math? ("Your last answer was correct and now I will go on")

A bit earlier in the same encounter implicit indexical repair takes place, this time as a response by the student to an implicit command for more information about why the student failed a course.

2-1) a C: Data Processing 111?
b S: An "F."
c C: That's your major, data processing--right? ("Tell me why you got an 'F'")
d S: Yeah, well I was ...I just talked with him and he said it was 'cause of excessive absences.
e C: Good for you, good for you. Math 101? ("What I am telling you is that's not good, but at least you didn't fail because you couldn't do the work. Now back to the question-answer sequence.")

Despite the student's failure outside the encounter in the classroom the counselor does not preach him a sermon on the intrinsic goodness of performing the student role well. A few moments later the student "fails" within the frame of the encounter itself, by not understanding the question-answer routine about courses this semester (Example 2-a through k). In the very next utterance (1) the student reveals something else wrong about his performance outside the encounter--he didn't take math. Here the counselor performs indexical repair and formulation explicitly--this could be serious:

2-2) k C: Math?
l S: Naw, I didn't take math.
m C: Did you register for it? ("I am checking to be sure you are not in trouble)
n S: No...I registered for speech instead of Math 'cause I.
o C: No, we don't have to drop your math class now.

You're not registered. See if you're registered in it and you don't attend you're gonna receive an "F" at the end of the semester. ("I'm still asking to be sure you are not in trouble.")

p S: Naw, I didn't even get a class card for it.

q C: OK, all right. Data Processing 112?

r S: Yeah, I have that.

s C: (Data Processing) 115?

t S: Yeah.

u C: All right, what else?

v S: And speech--I wanna drop that.

w C: Pardon me...You're all right, Sal.. (student laughs) when you gonna start working on that..Let's check out all your grades here--("By the pauses and my "all right" I am saying that you are a rapscallion who has been here in this junior college for five years and still hasn't graduated, but I like you. And by going on to total up your grades I am telling you othat I am going to let you get by again with taking fewer than the minimum required courses, and that I am letting you get by with it without preaching you a sermon on it.")

Here, despite "failure" outside and inside the frame of the encounter, the student is still given "special help" (waiving or bending organizational rules), and is given it indexically, as an insider. Explicit formulation is employed ("See if you're registered--") to be sure the student is not in bureaucratic difficulty. It is also employed ("Let's check out all your grades here--") to indicate the start of a new routine, instead of continuation in the previous routine, the next subroutine (or "slot") of which could have been a sermon on the student's transgressions.

The student referred to 2-2w when he watched his interview on videotape:

2-3) I really feel at ease because he's..he always seems to be joking with me. That's one good point right there. 'Cause ..like my mind is clear. Usually when I go in for an interview or anything my mind is kind of fuzzy, 'cause you know I'm nervous and everything, but he makes me feel at ease.. I can get what I want. 'Cause usually when I go in there I already know what I want, and sort of like it's a channel, you know, I'm going through.

This cordiality is in sharp contrast to another interview by the same counselor with a Polish-American student with whom he has low co-membership. Here indexical repair and formulation is done in a hostile manner.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

8) a C: All right, now choose...two courses from your general ed.
b S: Choose two of these courses?
c C: Right..any two of those courses.
d S: Can I ask for what?
e C: ...Could you ask for what?...For next semester... For September.
f S: Oh, OK.

Again with the same student later in the interview:

8-1) a C: All right, now let's have an elective..let's have a couple of electives..Do you want any more Business courses? (Nonverbal assent from student) All right, you want Business Law? Marketing? Uhhh...
b S: You might as...uh Business Law?
c C: Why Business Law?
d S: I'm..Well I..I guess wouldn't you want..if you wanna ever get in..I'm thinking some time maybe about getting my own business..You know and uh..you'll know more about it if you take Business Law..
e C: Just so you don't choose it because I said it. ("I'm telling you implicitly you need to assure me that you really want to take it.")
f S: No..oh that's what I..I'm saying it because of that ("What I just said in line d is what I really meant")
g C: Well, so far 3, 6, 9, 12, 13 hours..("By counting the hours out loud I am telling you that your last answer was satisfactory and that we are now moving on into a new routine.")

The "Just so you don't choose it because I said it" is an editorial on the interviewer's coerciveness that is reminiscent of Counselor 1's comment in 3-1 ("--or rather as I'm thinking of nursing for you.").

One final example of "hostile" means of repairing indexicality and doing formulation implicitly occurs still later in the same interview with the Polish-American student with low co-membership:

8-1) a C: You took a lot of remedial courses here.
b S: I know that's what hurt me.
c C: Well no it didn't hurt you..It kept (student overlaps next line here) ("I'm telling you that 8-1 b was the wrong answer")
d S: No it didn't hurt me, it helped me
e C: --it's preparing you for next few years...You know without these remediation courses you may not be here..agree?
f S: I agree.

In summary, the amount of indexical repairs used by counselors in the above examples does not vary according to the pan ethnic status of the student or according to the amount of co-membership with the student. (See the tables at the end of section 2-3.) The aspect of indexical repairs which does vary according to the amount of co-membership the counselor had with the student is the style the counselor used in repairing indexicality.[1] The counselor repaired indexicality using implicit formulation in high co-membership interviews, as in examples 2, 2-1, and 2-2. In low co-membership interviews, the counselor repaired indexicality using explicit formulation, as in examples 8, 8-1 and 8-2.

III. IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORIES OF INTERACTION AND INTER-ETHNIC RELATIONS

We have reported differences in the frequency and style of formulation done by school counselors and students in urban junior college in the United States. These differences, while interesting in themselves, also have more general theoretical implications. Our findings relate closely to the symbolic interactionist model for inter-ethnic relations proposed by Barth (1969).

Following Barth and Goffman (1961) we have made a number of assumptions. First, we assume that in order for interaction to take place, individuals confronting each other face to face need to know "who they are" as social persons. Second, we assume that in encounters

---

[1] The number of examples used to make this point is very small. The data contain many more examples which illustrate this point, but these could not be included because of limitations of time and space. These examples are being compiled in an appendix, which will be available at a future date from the authors.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

between strangers in complex polyethnic societies, "who we are" can be problematic, especially at the beginning of an encounter. Third, we assume that participants in institutionalized encounters between strangers begin with a few "givens" around which roles can be constructed --some persons are superordinate, others subordinate, some possess information and authority and represent organizational interests, others seek information or the disposition of their individual case in a way that maximizes their personal interest. Fourth, we assume that in most developed societies, universalistic relevance rules apply to bureaucratic encounters. These rules prescribe attending to such particularistic attributes of status as ethnicity, race, sex, and religious affiliation. They forbid constructing one's own role vis a vis another in terms of these particularistic aspects of social personage. (A counselor's relationship of rights and obligations with a student, for example, is supposed to be constructed only around such universalistic attributes of status as grades, test scores, academic program, and courses and course sequences completed.)

But the "givens" with which an encounter begins, such as superordination/subordination and student grades, do not exhaust all the options by which roles can be constructed or situations defined. In actual practice the roles that develop face to face are much more complex; differentiated according to particularistic aspects of social personage that are formally proscribed by universalistic relevance rules, yet that become extremely important features of definition of situation. These additional aspects of personage are discovered by participants during the course of an encounter. It may be that face to face interaction cannot

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

proceed without being grounded in particularistic attributes of status --these attributes are continuously present to encounter participants in the form of "diacritical marks" of status--dress, accent, demeanor (c.f. Barth 1969: 14-18). It seems that they cannot be ignored.

We have illustrated ways of speaking that seem dependent on particularistic attributes of status, such as ethnicity. "Whimperatives," with their contradictory social meanings, were employed mostly in inter pan-ethnic encounters by one counselor. Implicit indexical repair, conducted in a language of solidarity which presupposes "insider knowledge" by the hearer, was employed most in intra-ethnic encounters by another counselor. By employing or not employing certain language forms in doing formulation the counselor exhibits diacritica of his definition of the person he is talking to. Implicit indexical repair, for example, is a means of saying "you are one of us."

The student's participation in these ways of speaking in itself influences the ongoing definition of situation. For a student to show understanding of an implicit indexical repair is to demonstrate the "member" knowledge presupposed by the language of the repair. The display of such knowledge is diacritical--it confirms the student's status as "one of us" rather than "one of them." Conversely, to show lack of understanding during the course of an encounter can change the counselor's definition of the social personage of the student, and introduce the influence of self-fulfilling prophecy on the counselor's subsequent behavior. In the following example from counselor 2 with a Polish-American student, the student, who speaks with a noticeable accent, "loses" an interactional "point" by not understanding the question "what did you get?"

A few lines after this failure in face to face performance, the counselor asks, "You didn't fail anything, did you?" ("I'm telling you that you are a poor risk academically").

9) a C: What did you get in your Biology 101 last semester?
b S: Whad' I get?
c C: What did you get for a grade?
d S: B.
e C: B?
f S: Yeah.
g C: How 'bout Speech 101?
h S: Speech, uh..uh, I th..I think, I..I didn't get that one.
i C: What do you mean you didn't get it?
j S: I got some incomplete.
k C: Ah..how come?
l S: Th..then, I uh, ma..I did complete them. You know, then I make up the test..and then they gave me that..
m C: Did you make up the tests?
n S: The grades..Yes, I did.
o C: You don't know all the grades you got, though.
p S: I didn't _____ any C;s.
q C: You didn't fail anything, didja?

Barth contends (1969:17) that systematic constraints on role definition at the microsocial level of the face to face encounter reflect the articulation among and separation between ethnic groups at the macrosocial level. In our data we see that the ways in which speakers reveal "who they are" and reveal their expectations for who the other is (by such diacritica as formulation) are dependent upon ethnicity, but also transcend ethnicity. Ethnicity, as a category of social ascription, may generalize to pan-ethnicity, and pan-ethnicity may generalize to co-membership. Along with the language of solidarity goes a likelihood of special help from the counselor...bending or waiving bureaucratic rules. Under certain conditions of co-membership between persons of differing ethnicity the same manner of formulation may be used as that used between fellow ethnics.

Co-membership broadens the range of ways that encounters can be grounded particularistically. In a poly-ethnic society in which many institutionalized encounters between strangers are likely to be inter-ethnic, co-membership increases the likelihood of some kind of particularistic "leakage" within the

institutionalized encounters between strangers are likely to be inter-ethnic, co-membership increases the likelihood of some kind of particularistic "leakage" within the frame of the encounter. This increases the likelihood of more exceptions being made to universalistic rules for the disposition of cases, as persons in authority, such as counselors (or physicians, policemen, social workers) respond to the person they are talking to with the hospitality they are obliged to offer to fellow members (in one way or another) of the same urban village.

Thus the tendency of encounter participants to violate universalistic relevance rules, combined with the availability of co-membership to the ethnically "different" as a means of establishing some form of particularistic sharing, seems to provide necessary "play" in an otherwise too rigid and oversimplified social system. In a poly-ethnic industrial society, if persons did not have some means of violating the system's universalistic rules, they would be limited to grossly undifferentiated ways of perceiving and responding to others. Co-membership may provide enough "tolerance" (in the mechanical sense) for the social machine of a complex modern society to continue to operate.

It seems to us that this "play" is adaptive. It builds in exceptions to the rules as part of the rules. The "leakage" of particularistic aspects of definition of situation into institutionalized encounters in formal organizational settings may be so pervasive that attempts to limit relevance rules to universalistic attributes of status are bound to have limited success. Indeed these attempts if successful would be to our way of thinking maladaptive. Movements for universalistic reform

in the delivery of educational, medical, legal, and other "human" services may not lead to social amelioration, but to societal and interactional paralysis.

A WHIMSICAL EXAMPLE OF FORMULATION

(See Example 8, page 27, "Can I ask for what?, Could I ask for what?...:For next week's story.")

material deleted due to copyright restrictions

(Boston Globe,
Friday, December 1, 1973)

References

AUSTIN, J.L.

1962 How to Do Things with Words
Cambridge: Harvard University Press

BAR-HILLEL, YEHOSHUA

1952 "Mr. Geach on Rigour in Semantics" in
Mind 61 (April): 261-264

BARTH, FREDRIK

1969 Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social
Organization of Culture Difference
Boston: Little, Rown and Company

BATESON, GREGORY

1955 "A Theory of Play and Fantasy" in American
Psychiatric Research Reports, 4 in Gregory Bateson,
Steps Toward an Ecology of Mind
New York: Ballantine Books, 1972

BLOM, JAN-PETTER and JOHN GUMPERZ

1972 "Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code
Switching in Norway" in J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.)
Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of
Communication
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

BROWN, ROGER W. and A. GILMAN

1960 "The pronouns of power and solidarity" in
T. Sebeok (ed.) Style in Language
Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press

CICOUREL, AARON V.

1972 "Basic and Normative Rules in the Negotiation of
Status and Role" in D. Sudnow (ed.)
Studies in Social Interaction
New York: The Free Press

ERICKSON, FREDERICK

1973a "Talking to the Man: Some Conclusions from the Inter-
ethnic Communication Study Project" paper delivered at
symposium "Talking to the Man in the City Junior College,"
American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting,
March 1, 1973, New Orleans, La.

ERICKSON, FREDERICK

1973b "One Function of Proxemic Shifts in Face to Face Interaction" paper delivered at the 9th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Conference on the Organization of Behavior in Face to Face Interaction, August 28-30, 1973, Chicago, Illinois

1973c "Using Simple Quantitative Methods in Urban Anthropology" paper delivered at Conference on the Contribution of Anthropology to Public Policy Formulation, October 21-23, 1973, Philadelphia, Pa.

GARFINKEL, HAROLD and HARVEY SACKS

1970 "On Formal Structures of Practical Actions" in J.C. McKinney and E.A. Tiryakian (eds.) Theoretical Sociology: Perspectives and Developments New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts

GARNER, RICHARD

1971 "'Presupposition' in Philosophy and Linguistics," in C.J. Fillmore and D.T. Langendoen (eds.) Studies in Linguistic Semantics New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

GOFFMAN, ERVING

1959 The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday Anchor Books

1961 Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill

GREEN, G.M.

n.d. "How to get people to do things with words: The question of Whimperatives" unpublished manuscript

GRICE, H.P.

1961 "The causal theory of perception" Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society Supp. Vol. 35: 121-152

HYMES, DELL

1962 "The ethnography of speaking" in T. Gladwin and W.C. Sturtevant Anthropology and Human Behavior Washington, D.C.: Anthropological Society of Washington

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

KEENAN, EDWARD L.

1971 "Two kinds of Presupposition in Natural Language" in C.J. Fillmore and D.T. Langendoen (eds.) Studies in Linguistic Semantics New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

MOERMAN, MICHAEL

1969 "A Little Knowledge" in Steven A. Tyler (ed.) Cognitive Anthropology New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

PARSONS, TALCOTT

1951 The Social System Glencoe: The Free Press

SEARLE, JOHN R.

1969 Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

SIMMEL, GEORG

1950 The Sociology of Georg Simmel translated, edited, and with an introduction by Kurt H. Wolff Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press

WITTGENSTEIN, LUDWIG

1958 The Blue and Brown Books New York: Harper and Brothers

1968 (3rd ed.) Philosophical Investigations New York: MacMillan

References

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BARTH, FREDRIK

1969 Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference.
Boston: Little, Brown and Company

BATESON, GREGORY

1955 "A Theory of Play and Fantasy" in American Psychiatric Association Psychiatric Research Reports, 4 in Gregory Bateson, Steps Toward an Ecology of Mind.
New York: Ballantine Books, 1972.

BLOM, JAN-PETTER and JOHN J. GUMPERZ

1972 "Social Meaning in Linguistic Structure: Code Switching in Norway" in John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication.
New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston

DULAY, HEIDI and JEFFREY SHULTZ

1972 "Crosscultural Mis-communication in the Classroom", Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology, Montreal, Canada, April 8

GOFFMAN, ERVING

1961 Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction
Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill

LEONARD (DOLAN), CAROLYN

1972 "A Method for Film Analysis of Communication Style", Paper delivered at Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology, Montreal, Canada, April 8

SHULTZ, JEFFREY

1972 "The Search for Co-membership: An Analysis of Conversations between Strangers", Working Paper, Inter-ethnic Communication Study Project
Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard Graduate School of Education